



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/007,584

12/05/2001

Julius Kendall

06079-104

3539

26486

7590

02/27/2003

PERKINS, SMITH & COHEN LLP
ONE BEACON STREET
30TH FLOOR
BOSTON, MA 02108

EXAMINER

POLITZER, JAY L

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2856

DATE MAILED: 02/27/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.
10/007,584

Applicant(s)
Kendall

Examiner
Jay Politzer

Art Unit
2856



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12/5/01 and 1/30/03
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) 14-16 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 and 17-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☒ The proposed drawing correction filed on Feb 11, 2002 is: a) ☒ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). 5 6) ☐ Other:

Serial Number: 10/007,584
Art Unit: 2856

Title: HELICOPTER HOLLOW BLADE PRESSURE CHECK AND FILL
APPARATUS AND METHOD TO USE SAME
Filed: 12/5/01
Inventor(s): Kendall
Attorney(s): Borghetti

DETAILED ACTION

REJECTIONS OVER PRIOR ART UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102:

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. § 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

"A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States."

2. Claims 1, 5-8 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Sikorski Helicopter Technical Manual, hereinafter Sikorski.

Regarding Claims 1, 5-8 and 19; see Fig 1.

REJECTIONS OVER PRIOR ART UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103:

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

"A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) or (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same

Serial Number: 10/007,584
Art Unit: 2856

person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person."

4. Claims 2-4, 9-13 and 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Sikorski.

Regarding Claims 2, 9 and 20; Sikorski fails to teach a digital gauge. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide a digital pressure gauge because of greater reproducibility compared with analog.

Regarding Claims 3-4, 10-11 and 21-22; Sikorski fails to teach a battery power source. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a battery power source because the device is used in the field.

Regarding Claim 12; Sikorski fails to teach a check valve. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide a check valve to prevent back flow because it is good engineering procedure.

Regarding Claim 13; see P 9, ¶ h.

5. Claims 17-18 and are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Kendall.

Regarding Claim 17; Kendall all claim steps, or obvious variants thereof but fails to teach a digital gauge and

Serial Number: 10/007,584
Art Unit: 2856

a five minute equalization period. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide a digital pressure gauge because of greater reproducibility compared with analog. The stabilization period is obvious to one skilled in the art for particular blade/pressure combinations.

Regarding Claim 18; see Kendall.

DESCRIPTION OF UNAPPLIED ART:

6. All the prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure because it discloses *differential* as opposed to *absolute* pressure gauges. The Beckwith et al, Dominey et al, and Meisenheimer, Jr. patents all require only factory calibration, which is not considered onerous, and Dominey et al makes it clear, at Col 4, Li 51-52, that re-calibration is not required.

REMARKS:

All of the apparatus claims have been rejoined. Claims 1-22 are in the application. Claims 14-16 are withdrawn from consideration.

INQUIRIES:

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dr. Jay L. Politzer whose telephone number is (703) 305-4930 and whose facsimile number is (703) 308-7382
8. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Hezron E. Williams, can be reached at (703) 305-4705.

Serial Number: 10/007,504

Art Unit: 2856

9. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4900.

jlp 2/21/03

72P

HELEN KWOK
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Helen Kwok